



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21501

**Title:** Resuscitation of extremely preterm infants – controversies and current evidence

**Reviewer’s code:** 00646241

**Reviewer’s country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-16 16:17

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-13 05:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In the paper “Resuscitation of extremely premature infants – controversies and current evidence”, the authors Patel et al. present an interesting and important review on current knowledge and experiences regarding operation procedures in neonatology, focusing on some individual aspects – i.e. use of steroids in the antenatal phase, delayed cord clamping, temperature control, and lung pressurizing techniques (PEEP, CPAP, so-called sustained aeration), but also aspects of oxygenation, minimal / gentle handling, and others. The work is well written, based on a number of literature – however certainly not all that is available, and the conclusions are straight and stringent. However, some aspects should be clarified a bit more clearly. As the author state correctly, “one must remain cautious while making decisions based on cohort studies, which have the potential for unintended bias”. Although the work is based on an interesting collection of literature, it does not, like a meta-analysis, contain a critical analysis of the evidence levels of the cited publications. In fact, the border between evidence and eminence in the suggestions and conclusions of the paper becomes not fully visible. Apparently this has not been the intention of the authors who do not give any evidence levels of their suggestions at all. At several points, the authors declare that clear answers still are



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

not available to their questions, since several studies are still ongoing or are difficult to interpret, thus it appears like a work-in-progress report; at others, like in the passages regarding gentle handling, the work is rather like a textbook overview than a scientific review. These limitations put in mind, the work still is interesting to read and full of relevant information, thus worth being published.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21501

**Title:** Resuscitation of extremely preterm infants – controversies and current evidence

**Reviewer’s code:** 00742209

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-16 16:17

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-19 23:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Define the database used to identify the studies mentioned in this review (introduction) State 95%CI in the first paragraph of the discussion Clarify if the dosing schedule for betamethasone were the same in the studies shown in table 1. Clarify the odds in the numerator and denominator for the mortality OR shown in table 1. Clarify that the studies in table 2 showed the risk for death or BPD in very preterm babies was decreased with nasal cpap when compared to intubation (paragraph three in the section on ventilator support) Clarify the comparators in the estimates for relative risk in table 2 Clarify the ventilator methods used in the category “non cpap” in table 2